



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,894	11/28/2001	Michael Seul	464.1003 PCT US	1499
7590	08/23/2004		EXAMINER [REDACTED]	DO, PENSEE T
Eric P. Mirabel Bioarray Solutions 35 Technology Drive Warren, NJ 07059			ART UNIT [REDACTED]	PAPER NUMBER 1641

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/995,894	SEUL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pensee T. Do	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/25/2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is indefinite because while the preamble recites a method for manipulating cells, the last step is an illuminating step to control the movement of cells. It is unclear whether that the step of control the movement of the cells is part of the manipulation step.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No.

Art Unit: 1641

6,251,691 ('691). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because patent '691 claims a method of controlling the movement of particles suspended at an interface between an electrode an electrolyte solution, the method comprising the following steps: generating an electric field at said interface between said electrode and said electrolyte solution; and illuminating the surface of said electrode with a predetermined light pattern to control the movement of said particles in accordance with said predetermined light pattern and electrochemical properties of said electrode.

Patent '691 differs from the instant invention in that it claims the movement of *particles* instead of *cells* as claimed in the instant invention.

Since patent '691 teaches that:

“[As a result, the electric field-induced assembly of planar aggregates and arrays applies to such] diverse particles as: colloidal polymer lattices (“latex beads”, lipid vesicles, whole chromosomes, cells and biomolecules including proteins and DNA, as well as metal or semiconductor colloids and clusters.”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to manipulate cells instead of particles in general using the same steps of the method in patent '691.

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,387,707 ('707). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because patent '707 teaches a method of forming an assembly of cells in a designated area on a light-sensitive electrode

comprising a plurality of cells suspended at an interface between said light-sensitive electrode and electrolyte solution; generating an electric field at the interface; and illuminating the interface with a predetermined light pattern to form a planar assembly of substantially one layer of cells in a designated area on the light-sensitive electrode, wherein the designated area is defined by the pattern of illumination. Claim 4 of patent '707 recites the method further comprises the step of spatially varying the light pattern to cause the alteration of the assembly, said alteration being selected from the group consisting of disassembly, disassembly followed by reassembly, repositioning the assembly, reconfiguration of the assembly and segmentation of the assembly which is equivalent to the control of movement of cells. The light pattern is affected by the electrode properties such as oxide growth, surface chemical patterning or surface profiling (see claim 3).

Patent '707 differs from the present invention in that it claims a method of forming an assembly of cells instead of a method of manipulating cells.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to manipulate cells using the method of patent '707 because "manipulation" encompasses "forming an assembly or controlling the movement of cells".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pensee T. Do whose telephone number is 571-272-0819. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pensee T. Do
Patent Examiner
August 17, 2004



CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800/1641
8/19/04